

May 12, 2021

## Medicaid and Incarcerated Individuals

Medicaid is a joint federal-state means-tested entitlement program that finances the delivery of primary and acute medical services, as well as long-term services and supports, for a diverse low-income population. States that operate their programs within broad federal rules are entitled to federal Medicaid matching funds. (For more information about Medicaid, see CRS Report R43357, *Medicaid: An Overview*.)

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA; P.L. 111-48, as amended), and a subsequent Supreme Court decision (*National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*), made it optional for states to expand Medicaid coverage to non-elderly adults with income up to 133% of the federal poverty level beginning in 2014. This created a new eligibility pathway for such adults based solely on income rather than on other categorical criteria, such as disability, being a parent of dependent children, or being a pregnant woman. In states that expanded Medicaid, many individuals transitioning into and out of incarceration—a population that tends to have higher rates of substance use disorder, mental illness, and chronic disease than the general population—were eligible for Medicaid for the first time. This In Focus describes how incarceration can impact the availability of federal Medicaid payment and an individual's Medicaid coverage.

### Medicaid Inmate Payment Exclusion

Historically, Medicaid has not been a major source of funding for the health care of incarcerated individuals. This is mainly because federal Medicaid statute generally prohibits the use of federal Medicaid funds to pay for the health care of an “inmate of a public institution” (hereinafter referred to as the *inmate payment exclusion*) except when the individual is a “patient in a medical institution” that is organized for the primary purpose of providing medical care. Additionally, pre-ACA, many incarcerated individuals did not meet Medicaid eligibility criteria, so when the inmate was a patient in a medical institution, the stays were not billable to Medicaid (see “Medicaid Payment During Incarceration”).

### Inmates of Public Institutions

Generally, an individual detained in a local jail, state or federal prison, detention facility, or other setting that is organized for the primary purpose of involuntary confinement is an *inmate of a public institution* for the purposes of Medicaid. *Public institution* is defined in federal regulation as “an institution that is the responsibility of a governmental unit or over which a governmental unit exercises administrative control,” with exceptions for types of settings such as medical institutions, among others. Federal regulations define *inmate* as someone living in a public institution, with certain exceptions for individuals living in public educational/vocational institutions to secure

education or vocational training or individuals residing in a public institution temporarily (e.g., pending arrangements for community residence).

In a 2016 State Health Official (SHO) letter (SHO # 16-007), the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) provided additional guidance on the definition of *inmate*, stating, “CMS considers an individual of any age to be an inmate if the individual is in custody and held involuntarily through operation of law enforcement authorities in a public institution.” Thus, for the purposes of Medicaid, CMS does not distinguish between individuals who are detained in a public institution pending disposition of charges and those who are incarcerated post-sentencing. Individuals are *not* considered inmates for the purposes of Medicaid if they have “freedom of movement” (e.g., ability to work outside a facility, to seek health treatment in a community setting). Therefore, individuals on probation or parole, under home confinement, residing in halfway houses under the jurisdiction of state or local governments, etc., are *not* considered inmates.

### Medicaid Payment During Incarceration

Public institutions are required to provide medical care to inmates as a consequence of the 1972 Supreme Court ruling *Estelle v. Gamble*, which found that deliberate indifference to a prisoner's serious injury or illness constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. Inmate health care can be costly for state and local governments, and billing Medicaid can offset a portion of these expenses for coverable services when eligible inmates are inpatient for 24 hours or longer in a medical institution (for details on inmate eligibility and enrollment, see “Medicaid Eligibility for Inmates”). CMS provides guidance on which settings qualify as *medical institutions* in its 2016 SHO letter, stating that medical institutions can include hospitals, nursing facilities, and intermediate care facilities for individuals with an intellectual disability that are certified Medicaid providers, also serve members of the general public, and house and provide treatment based on medical need rather than incarceration status, among other criteria.

Services provided to inmates in medical institutions on an *outpatient* basis still are subject to the inmate payment exclusion. Similarly, any inpatient and outpatient medical services provided in settings that “primarily or exclusively” treat inmates are subject to the inmate payment exclusion because they are considered correctional (not medical) settings. Separate 2016 guidance (S&C: 16-21-ALL) from CMS provides that such settings can, among other things, limit personal privacy, restrict choice of physician, and use nonmedical restraint, all of which would disqualify them from obtaining certification as a Medicaid provider.

Medicaid’s “patient in a medical institution” exception applies to federal inmates, but the Bureau of Prisons chooses to retain responsibility for the payment of health care services for its inmates, so in practice, the policy is not applied to inmates in federal prisons.

## Medicaid Eligibility for Inmates

Inmates who are eligible for, or enrolled in, Medicaid do not become ineligible for Medicaid based on their inmate status alone. The statutory inmate payment exclusion is a *coverage* (not an eligibility) exclusion. However, historically, most states had policies to terminate an inmate’s Medicaid enrollment, in part as a way to avoid inappropriate billing. If the inmate needed an inpatient hospitalization, the public institution would need to facilitate Medicaid enrollment of the inmate to bill Medicaid for the stay. In addition, inmates whose Medicaid was terminated during incarceration would have to reapply for Medicaid and be deemed eligible by the state to have full Medicaid coverage upon release (statute requires that states accept inmates’ Medicaid applications). Since the reapplication process could lead to a gap in Medicaid coverage following incarceration (due to uncertain release dates, delayed eligibility determinations, etc.), CMS sought to address this issue via guidance that permits states to suspend Medicaid for incarcerated individuals.

## Medicaid Suspension for Inmates

### Early CMS Guidance on Medicaid Suspension

In 2004 guidance, CMS permitted states to suspend an inmate’s Medicaid so that it could be more quickly reinstated upon release from incarceration (or in the case of an inpatient hospitalization). The 2016 CMS SHO letter offered similar direction by recommending that states place “the inmate in a suspended eligibility status” or “suspend coverage by establishing markers and edits in the claims processing system to deny claims for excluded services.” An eligibility suspension effectively pauses an inmate’s Medicaid eligibility without terminating it. A coverage suspension maintains an inmate’s eligibility but limits coverage to allowable inpatient services. Both suspension methods can achieve the same end goal of faster reinstatement of full Medicaid coverage upon release from incarceration. Public institutions, states, and local jurisdictions were not required to actively facilitate Medicaid suspension (or enrollment) for inmates until recent changes to law required them to do so for certain inmates (see “Recent Laws and Related Guidance”).

### Timing of Medicaid Suspension

In general, the process of Medicaid suspension can require extensive coordination between corrections and the state Medicaid agency, as well as information technology system changes. This, in addition to unique state and local policies and processes, among other factors, contributes to variability in when states or jurisdictions initiate Medicaid suspension during an incarceration; for example, one jurisdiction could wait 24 hours, whereas another could wait 60 days. The full range of when jurisdictions suspend Medicaid is difficult to determine. Similarly, data on the average length of time between an inmate entering jail or state or federal prison and Medicaid suspension are not

readily available. Waiting to implement a Medicaid suspension can reduce administrative burden and the potential for unnecessary interruption in Medicaid coverage, but it also can create the risk of inappropriate billing of Medicaid.

## Recent Laws and Related Guidance

The Substance Use-Disorder Prevention That Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act (SUPPORT Act; P.L. 115-271) prohibits states from terminating Medicaid eligibility for “eligible juveniles”; instead, the law allows states to suspend Medicaid. *Eligible juveniles* are defined as individuals under 21 years of age and former foster youth up to the age of 26 who become incarcerated while enrolled in Medicaid or are determined eligible for Medicaid while incarcerated. The SUPPORT Act also requires states to redetermine the eligibility of eligible juveniles whose Medicaid is suspended, or to accept and make timely eligibility determinations on new Medicaid applications for eligible juveniles, to enable full coverage upon release. The SUPPORT Act does *not* change the inmate payment exclusion; Medicaid coverage for eligible juveniles is still limited to inpatient services. The law generally applies to eligible juveniles who become inmates of public institutions on or after October 24, 2019.

A January 2021 State Medicaid Director Letter (SMD #21-002) from CMS provides guidance to states on implementation of the SUPPORT Act, advising that for eligible juveniles states can (1) suspend Medicaid *benefits*, (2) suspend Medicaid *eligibility*, or (3) both of these approaches. The guidance details that by suspending Medicaid *benefits*, an eligible juvenile would remain enrolled in Medicaid but coverage would be limited to inpatient services. Alternatively, suspending an eligible juvenile’s Medicaid *eligibility* effectively pauses the inmate’s Medicaid entirely, preventing Medicaid coverage for any services. When eligibility is suspended, states must lift the suspended status to be able to bill and receive federal matching funds for eligible inpatient stays.

The total number of inmates impacted by the SUPPORT Act is relatively small, and the act’s prohibition on Medicaid termination for eligible juveniles does not extend to the majority of the inmate population. However, most states choose to suspend Medicaid for their adult inmate populations, as well. According to a state FY2019 Kaiser Family Foundation survey, 42 states suspended rather than terminated Medicaid for jail inmates and 43 states did so for prison inmates.

## Recent Legislation

Bills that address Medicaid coverage for inmates have been introduced in the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress. The Medicaid Reentry Act of 2021 (H.R. 955/S. 285) would remove the Medicaid payment exclusion for Medicaid enrolled inmates (including juveniles) in the 30 days prior to release from a public institution. Effectively, it would allow states to receive federal matching funds for state plan services delivered to Medicaid-enrolled inmates during the specified period. Similar bills were introduced in the 116<sup>th</sup> Congress.

---

**Evelyne P. Baumrucker**, Specialist in Health Care  
Financing

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.